

## REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

In complete response to the Office Action dated November 17, 2006, on the above identified application, reconsideration is respectfully requested. Claims 37-72 are pending in this application.

With this amendment, claims 37, 42, 43, and 48-56 are amended, and claims 57-72 are cancelled without prejudice. Applicants submit that the amendments do not raise new issues requiring further search or consideration. In particular, claims 37, 42, and 48-56 are amended only to correct antecedent basis issues – the scope and content of the claims is otherwise unchanged. Further, claim 43 (which stands objected to as depending on a rejected base claim) has been rewritten in independent form and is therefore believed to be in condition for allowance. Amendments were also made to claim 43 to address minor antecedent basis issues.

### Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102:

Claims 37, 41, 44, and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by *Gregg et al.* (US 6,199,599; hereinafter “*Gregg*”).

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claim. *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

In this case, *Gregg* does not disclose “each and every element as set forth in the claim”.

For example, *Gregg* does not disclose a system having a sealed chemical container apparatus and a recharge container apparatus in fluid communication with each other (via a second connection joint), a pressurization gas apparatus in fluid communication with the containers (via the first joint connection and third joint

connection, respectively), and a purge gas apparatus adapted to deliver a purge gas from a source to the chemical container apparatus as recited in claim 37. Such an arrangement requires a separate pressurization gas apparatus and purge gas apparatus, and corresponding separate connections (connection joints). *Gregg* does not disclose such a system.

To the contrary, *Gregg* discloses that the pressurization gas source and the purge gas source are the same. In this regard, attention is directed to column 13, lines 1-40 where *Gregg* describes normal chemical delivery during processing followed by a purge cycle. During normal chemical delivery, *Gregg* states that "pressurized gas from a source (not shown) is released by regulator 32 into line 31", as represented by dashed line 220 in FIG. 4B, in order to pressurize a canister 104 and cause a liquid chemical to flow up a dip tube. Column 13, lines 5-15; FIG. 4B. During the purge cycle, the regulator 32 once again allows the pressurized gas to enter line 31. See, column 13, lines 53-59 and FIG. 4F. The same arrangement is disclosed in the other embodiments of *Gregg* where the same gas (helium) is input to the same gas input 518/618/718, so that the pressurization gas (used during delivery of a chemical to a point of use) is the same as the purge gas (used during the purging cycle) and is delivered via the same connection infrastructure. Thus, *Gregg* does not teach, show or suggest a system in which at least two canisters are fluidly connected to two separate gas sources, one being a pressurized gas source and the other being a purge gas source, via separate connections (connection joints).

Therefore, the claims are believed to be allowable and Applicants respectfully request allowance of the same.

#### **Allowable Subject Matter:**

The Applicants thank the Examiner for giving notice that claims 38-40, 42, 43, and 46-56 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 43 has been rewritten in independent form and is therefore believed to be in condition for allowance. With respect to the other objected to claims, Applicants believe that because the base

claims should be allowed for the reasons given above, it follows that the dependent objected to claims should also be allowed. Accordingly, allowance of claims 38-40, 42, 43, and 46-56 is respectfully requested.

## **CONCLUSION**

Accordingly, it is believed that the present application now stands in condition for allowance. Early notice to this effect is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner believe a telephone call would expedite the prosecution of the application, he is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted, and  
S-signed pursuant to 37 CFR 1.4,

/Gero G. McClellan, Reg. No. 44,227/

---

Gero G. McClellan  
Registration No. 44,227  
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.  
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500  
Houston, TX 77056  
Telephone: (713) 623-4844  
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846  
Attorney for Applicants